# Criterion EB-1A Petition Assessment Summary

## 1. Personal Background

Mr. Inkin graduated with honors from Nizhny Novgorod State Technical University with a Bachelor's degree and an Engineer's degree in Information Technology. In his 19 year career, he has worked as a software developer specializing in backend development with PHP and frontend development with Flutter. He has held roles such as CTO, Senior PHP Developer, and Lead Flutter Developer at companies in Russia, the UK, and Georgia.

## 2. Expert Recommendation Letters

Supporting letter from Google confirming Mr. Inkin's status as a Google Developer Expert in Flutter, placing him in the top 0.025% of Flutter developers worldwide.

Supporting letter from <Apache Member>, <Title at The Apache Software Foundation>, attesting to Mr. Inkin's critical contributions and leadership role in developing two major web applications for the Apache Beam project.

Supporting letter from <Akvelon Officer>, <Title at Akvelon>, describing Mr. Inkin's leading role in developing the Flutter Code Editor which has become the 2nd most popular code editor for Flutter.

Supporting letter from <Calltouch Officer>, <Title at Calltouch>, detailing Mr. Inkin's critical role in fixing vulnerabilities and improving the authentication system for the company's products.

Supporting letter from Sergey Gran, owner of Sergey Gran's School, crediting Mr. Inkin's IT solutions for helping accelerate the company's growth and quadrupling revenue.

## 3. Media and Judging Roles

Invited to judge applications for IEEE Senior Membership grade.

Approved to judge the 2024 CODiE Awards by the Software and Information Industry Association (SIIA).

9 of Mr. Inkin's technical articles were selected for wider distribution by Medium's curation team.

One of Mr. Inkin's articles was posted on the LinkedIn blog of FlutterDevs which has over 95,000 followers.

## 4. Red Flags

* Repetitive Language:  
  No significant instances of repetitive or boilerplate language were found across the recommendation letters or other evidence. The letters appear to provide specific details and insights relevant to Mr. Inkin's qualifications and achievements.
* Generic Claims:  
  The petition avoids generic or unsubstantiated claims. Statements about Mr. Inkin's impact and innovations are supported by specific examples, technical details, metrics, and 3rd party validations.
* Weak Substantiation:  
  The evidence provided, including screenshots, web links, download statistics, and expert testimonials, provides robust substantiation for the claims made about Mr. Inkin's achievements and their significance. No major claims appear to lack credible supporting documentation.
* Unsupported Salary:  
  Mr. Inkin's high salary claims are supported by his official bank statements and tax records, as well as authoritative data on industry salary benchmarks in the relevant country. The salary information appears credible and well-contextualized.
* Inconsistent Field:  
  Mr. Inkin's expertise and achievements consistently center around software development, specifically in the areas of backend development (PHP) and cross-platform frontend development (Flutter). His academic background, work history, and acclaimed contributions all align with a focused specialization in this field.

## 5. Criteria-specific evidence

## 5. Summary

Qualification Path: ten\_criteria

Status: qualified

Criteria Met: 5

Total Criteria Checked: 10

## 6. Detailed Criterion Evaluation

### Criterion 1: Documentation of the alien's receipt of lesser nationally or internationally recognized prizes or awards for excellence in the field of endeavor.

Meets Criterion: True

Reasoning:  
The petition provides strong evidence that the Google Developer Expert award and 3rd place finish in the 'Digital Breakthrough' hackathon meet the requirements for Criterion 1. Key points: Google Developer Expert: - Internationally recognized award from Google - Requires 'solid expertise' and 'significant contributions' in the developer community, demonstrating it is granted for excellence in the beneficiary's field of software development - Only about 1000 experts worldwide out of millions of developers, indicating high selectivity and prestige - Recognized by industry leaders like JetBrains - More LinkedIn followers than the Academy that grants the Oscars, showing its prominence 'Digital Breakthrough' 3rd Place: - National hackathon in Russia with no geographic restrictions on participants - Judging criteria focused on software prototype, implementation, and user experience, demonstrating relevance to beneficiary's field - Organized by a government-established non-profit, indicating national recognition - Media coverage on organizer's website

Issues Detected:

Awards:

* Google Developer Expert
* 'Digital Breakthrough' hackathon, 3rd place, team competition

Missing Elements:

Suggested Supporting Evidence:

* Documentary evidence of past notable Google Developer Expert recipients and their accomplishments could further demonstrate the prestige of the award
* Any media coverage or official government announcements of the 'Digital Breakthrough' hackathon results would reinforce the national scope and recognition of the competition

### Criterion 2: Documentation of the alien's membership in associations in the field which demand outstanding achievement of their members.

Meets Criterion: True

Reasoning:  
The petition provides strong evidence that the beneficiary's membership in both IEEE at the Senior level and in the Google Developer Experts program meets this criterion. For IEEE Senior membership, the petition shows that IEEE is a distinguished association in the beneficiary's field, Senior membership requires 10 years of professional experience with 5 years of significant performance, and Senior member applications are judged by panels of current Senior members and Fellows. For Google Developer Experts, the petition demonstrates that the program requires outstanding expertise and significant contributions to the field, and that applicants are evaluated through interviews with existing Experts and Google employees who are recognized authorities.

Issues Detected:

Associations:

* Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE)
* Google Developer Experts (GDE)

Missing Elements:

Suggested Supporting Evidence:

### Criterion 3: Published material about the alien in professional or major trade publications or other major media, relating to the alien's work in the field.

Meets Criterion: False

Reasoning:  
The petition does not include any published materials about the beneficiary or the beneficiary's work in the field. To satisfy this criterion, the petitioner needs to provide evidence of published material about the beneficiary in professional or major trade publications or other major media, relating to the beneficiary's work in the field.

Missing Elements:

* No published materials provided
* No evidence of publications being professional, major trade, or major media
* No information on publication circulation or reach
* No information on intended audience of publications

Suggested Supporting Evidence:

* Articles from professional journals, major newspapers, magazines, or industry publications that feature the beneficiary and discuss their specific work and achievements in the field
* Media kits or audience reports showing the credibility and reach of the publications
* Screenshots or scans of the published material clearly showing the publication name, date, and relevant excerpts
* Evidence the published material results from independent journalistic reporting, not paid promotional content

### Criterion 4: Evidence of the alien's participation, either individually or on a panel, as a judge of the work of others in the same or an allied field.

Meets Criterion: True

Reasoning:  
The evidence shows that in November 2023, Mr. Inkin served on the IEEE Senior Member Application Review Panel, where he judged 11 applications for the IEEE Senior Membership grade. The fields covered by IEEE, including 'Computer sciences and information technology', are the same as or allied to Mr. Inkin's field of Software Development. The petition provides an email invitation, confirmation of Mr. Inkin's registration, and screenshots proving he reviewed the 11 applications. It also includes a thank-you letter from the 2023 IEEE Admission and Advancement Committee Chair. This judging activity meets the criterion.

Judging Roles:

* Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) Senior Member Application Review Panel: Panel member

Missing Elements:

Suggested Supporting Evidence:

### Criterion 5: Evidence of the alien's original scientific, scholarly, artistic, athletic, or business-related contributions of major significance in the field.

Meets Criterion: True

Reasoning:  
The two contributions by Mr. Inkin - the improvement to PHPStan and the Flutter Code Editor - are clearly original works that had major significance and impact in the field of software development. The PHPStan contribution improved a critical tool used across the PHP industry that powers most websites, resulting in better code quality. The Flutter Code Editor is enabling more efficient development of Flutter apps which are growing in popularity. Both works are recognized by experts and practitioners in the field as evidenced by the supporting letters, usage metrics, and adoption in major projects.

Contributions:

* Improvement to PHPStan, the most popular static analyzer for PHP programming language

Impact: The contribution significantly reduced false-positive errors reported by PHPStan, making it suitable for adoption in large projects across the PHP industry, which powers over 76% of websites worldwide. This resulted in improved code quality and stability in the industry.

* Flutter Code Editor, the 2nd most popular code editor for Flutter apps

Impact: The code editor with its advanced features like code folding, error highlighting, autocomplete led to a paradigm shift where much more development can be done directly in Flutter apps, streamlining work and decreasing dependency on desktop IDEs. It is already widely adopted.

Missing Elements:

Suggested Supporting Evidence:

### Criterion 6: Evidence of the alien's authorship of scholarly articles in professional or major trade publications or other major media.

Meets Criterion: False

Reasoning:  
While the petitioner has authored technical articles that were selected for wider distribution on Medium and a Flutter-focused LinkedIn blog with a large following, these do not meet the bar of being scholarly articles published in professional journals, major trade publications or other major media after undergoing peer review or a formal editorial process.

Articles:

* Never have separate sign-in routes (Medium)
* The new lint in Dart 3.2 (FlutterDevs LinkedIn blog)

Missing Elements:

* Evidence that Medium or LinkedIn blog posts undergo peer review
* Proof that Medium or a LinkedIn blog qualifies as a professional journal or major trade publication

Suggested Supporting Evidence:

* Publication of the articles in established peer-reviewed journals in the field of software development
* Proof of a rigorous editorial review process if published in trade magazines
* Evidence of the prestige and circulation of the trade publications

### Criterion 7: Evidence of the display of the alien's work in exhibitions or showcases.

Meets Criterion: False

Reasoning:  
The petition does not include any evidence of the beneficiary's work being displayed at artistic exhibitions or showcases. The beneficiary's background is in software development, and the petition focuses on his technical contributions and recognition in that field. It does not mention any artistic works created by the beneficiary or their display at curated artistic venues.

Missing Elements:

* No examples provided of any artistic works created by the beneficiary
* No documentation of the beneficiary's work being displayed at any venues
* No evidence that the beneficiary has participated in artistic exhibitions or showcases

Suggested Supporting Evidence:

* If applicable, provide examples of artistic works created by the beneficiary, such as photographs, videos, digital art, etc.
* Submit documentation showing these works were displayed at recognized artistic venues, such as galleries, museums, curated online platforms, or juried art shows
* Include exhibition catalogs, brochures, invitations or other promotional materials listing the beneficiary as a featured artist
* Provide press coverage, reviews or social media posts demonstrating the artistic nature and curatorial standards of the venues

### Criterion 8: Evidence that the alien has performed in a leading or critical role for organizations or establishments that have a distinguished reputation.

Could not parse this criterion.

### Criterion 9: Evidence that the alien has commanded a high salary or other significantly high remuneration for services in relation to others in the field.

Meets Criterion: True

Reasoning:  
The petition provides strong evidence that Mr. Inkin commanded a salary significantly higher than others in his field while working at Akvelon in Georgia from 2022 Q3 to 2023 Q2. His annual salary of 167014.90 GEL (equivalent to 62047.62 USD) is shown to be 3 times the median IT salary in Georgia reported by Forbes and 2.02 times the average salary in Computer programming reported by the National Statistics Office for the exact same time period. The salary amount is well supported by an official response from the Revenue Service, bank statements, employment contract, and termination agreement. No issues or gaps in the evidence were identified.

Salary Records:

* 2022 Q3 - 2023 Q2: 167014.90 GEL (equivalent to 62047.62 USD)

Missing Elements:

Suggested Supporting Evidence:

### Criterion 10: Evidence of commercial successes in the performing arts, as shown by box office receipts or record, cassette, compact disk, or video sales.

Meets Criterion: False

Reasoning:  
The petition does not contain any evidence of the beneficiary's commercial successes in the performing arts. The beneficiary's background is in software development, not performing arts. No information was provided about box office receipts, record sales, or other metrics demonstrating commercial success for any performing arts productions.

Missing Elements:

* No examples of the beneficiary's involvement in performing arts productions
* No proof of actual sales, revenue or earnings for any performing arts work
* No comparative data to show success is significant compared to industry benchmarks

Suggested Supporting Evidence:

* If applicable, submit box office statements, ticket sales reports, or other financial records for performing arts productions the beneficiary substantially participated in
* Provide official music or video sales reports from recognized industry sources (e.g., Nielsen SoundScan, Billboard charts) showing units sold
* Include data comparing the commercial performance of the beneficiary's work to other similar productions to demonstrate the success is notable